## REMARK

In response to the Office Action dated March 22, 2006, the response time to which has been extended by a concurrently filed Request for a One-Month Extension of Time and fee, entry of this Communication is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Restriction has been required between Group I, claims 1-18 drawn to a shipping container and Group II, claims 19-20 drawn to a support dunnage.

Applicants elect Group II, claims 19 – 24 drawn to a support dunnage.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has also required an election between what the Examiner contends are four patentably distinct species, namely the species shown in Figs. 3, 4, 12, and 13. With respect to this election, the Applicants contend that the Examiner is misinterpreting the subject matter of Figs. 12 and 13. Fig. 13 illustrates an insert block which is mountable in the second support shown in Fig. 12, the combined support being shown in Fig. 14. As such, Applicants elect Fig. 12.. The claims readable thereon include claims 19-48.

Entry of this Communication is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG, BASILE, HANLON, MacFARLANE,

WOOD & HELMHOLDT, P.C.

William M. Hanlon, Jr.

Attorney for Applicant(s) Registration No. 28422

(248) 649-3333

3001 West Big Beaver Rd., Suite 624

Troy, Michigan 48084-3107

Dated: May 22, 2006

WMH/dge